



Liturgical Drama and the Reimagining of Medieval Theater

Michael Norton



EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

Liturgical Drama and the
Reimagining of Medieval Theater

EARLY DRAMA, ART, AND MUSIC

Medieval Institute Publications is a program of
The Medieval Institute, College of Arts and Sciences



WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Liturgical Drama and the
Reimagining of Medieval Theater

by
Michael Norton

Early Drama, Art, and Music

MEDIEVAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo

Copyright © 2017 by the Board of Trustees of Western Michigan University

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
are available from the Library of Congress.**

ISBN: 9781580442626

eISBN: 9781580442633

All rights reserved. Without limiting the rights under copyright reserved above, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in, or introduced into a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the written permission of both the copyright owner and the author of the book.

Every effort has been made to obtain permission to use all copyrighted illustrations reproduced in this book. Nonetheless, whosoever believes to have rights to this material is advised to contact the publisher.

Chapter 1

A Prodigious Birth: Creating “Liturgical Drama”

BY THE EARLY 1830S, France was accustomed to upheaval. From the revolution of 1787 to the terror that followed, from the rise of Napoléon to the restoration of the monarchy and the July Revolution, France had undergone profound changes in its culture and in its institutions. Largely unnoticed in the tumult, a librarian from the Royal Library in Paris offered a novel approach to the study of drama that spawned an upheaval of its own. He argued that drama was not reborn in modern times following its untimely death at the hands of early Christians. Rather, drama had never ceased to exist, expressing itself from time to time within the liturgy of the medieval western Church. To convey this understanding, he conceived the metaphor “liturgical drama,” a broadly construed expression that he used to capture a great many representational aspects of medieval religious practice. While the expression itself would endure, its metaphorical sense was transient, and by the middle of France’s Second Empire it yielded to the genre that remains with us today. The story of this passage, from metaphorical youth to categorical maturity, is one of both persistence and serendipity. And it took place at the juncture where studies in musicology, iconography, liturgiology, literature, and theater began their campaigns to recapture (or perhaps rebrand) the monuments of their medieval past.

Charles Magnin and the Drama in the Liturgy (1834–1835)

The expression “liturgical drama” (or “drame liturgique”) was coined by Charles Magnin and introduced to the scholarly community during a course on the origins of modern theater given at the Sorbonne during the academic year 1834–1835.¹ Magnin was the curator of printed books at the Bibliothèque royale in Paris and served for that year as the acting pro-

fessor for the chair of foreign literature in the Faculté des lettres.² Magnin was highly regarded by his peers, both as a critic and as a scholar. He was the subject of two essays by Charles Augustin Sainte-Beuve,³ and upon his death in 1862, his eulogy was offered by none other than Paulin Paris, vice-president of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres and director of the Bibliothèque impériale in Paris (not to mention the father of Gaston Paris).⁴ Magnin's influence reverberated well beyond his death, and he was memorialized by Henri Alexandre Wallon with an extensive biography and bibliography on the twentieth anniversary of his passing.⁵

Magnin's course galvanized the incipient community of Parisian medievalists and literary scholars. French drama, he argued, did not originate *ex nihilo* during the fourteenth century as his predecessors had maintained, but developed from earlier forms of drama born within, and borne by, the ritual of the medieval Church. Magnin noted the magnitude of this claim a decade later in his review of Monmerqué and Michel's *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge*: "It would have been quite astonishing twenty years ago if we had seen a volume entitled: French Theater in the Middle Ages, during the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries. It was then universally accepted that the birthplace of the theater in France goes back no further than the performance given by the confraternity of the village of Saint-Maur around 1398, and in Paris, in a room of the Hôpital de la Trinité in 1402."⁶ Five years later, Edmond de Coussemaker similarly observed: "A mere twenty-five years ago, it was still believed with Beauchamps and the brothers Parfaict that the modern art of drama did not date from a time earlier than the fourteenth century. It seemed at the least to have slept for a long time, until this branch of literature and archeology, like many others long forgotten, finally attracted the attention of scholars."⁷

For Magnin, the development of modern drama had followed the same path as had the drama of the ancients, moving from ecclesiastical to aristocratic to popular.⁸ This was not a developmental, or teleological progression, however. Rather it was, as John M. Manly would later reassert,⁹ a series of separate beginnings. For Magnin there were three classes, or families, for the *jeux scéniques* of the Middle Ages, whose origins could be treated separately. The first encompassed "the marvelous, theocratic religious theater, the grand theater, that had for its stage the naves of Hagia Sophia, of Santa Maria Maggiore, the cathedrals of Strasbourg, of Rouen, of Rheims, and of Cambrai, the monasteries of Corbie, of Saint-Martial, of Gandersheim, and of St. Alban."¹⁰ The second family included "the manorial and royal theater, that shone in the palaces of the dukes of Provence,

Normandy, Brittany and Aquitaine, in the dungeons of the counts of Champagne; in the castles of the lords of Coucy, for the feasts of the kings of France and England, in the court of the emperor, in the official receptions of the kings of Sicily and Aragon.”¹¹ The third family then embraced “the popular and fairground theater that came and went regularly on certain days with great noise and gaiety in the streets of Florence, on the quays and canals of Venice, in the public squares of London and Paris.”¹²

What we know of Magnin’s course comes from notes to his lectures published between 1834 and 1836¹³ and from a series of articles that appeared in the *Revue des deux mondes* and the *Journal des savants* between 1834 and 1861.¹⁴ His opening lecture, published in full in the December 1834 issue of the *Revue des deux mondes*, offered the earliest, seemingly unambiguous use of the expression “drame liturgique.”¹⁵ Magnin spoke of the grand spectacle of contemporary opera as successor to the pious representations of medieval confraternities, which “had themselves followed others more solemn and more serious, true liturgical dramas, approved by the papacy and by the councils, admitted in the diurnals and rituals, played and sung in the processions and in the cathedrals.”¹⁶

While it is tempting to interpret Magnin’s words according to our current understanding of the expression, it is unclear to what Magnin actually referred with the words “drame liturgique.” In the notes to his lectures, the expression appears only once more, and its reference is even less clear. Speaking of the second-century *Exagoge* of Ezekiel (assigned by Magnin to the fourth century), Magnin observed: “Indeed, while the human spirit was gradually developing among the clergy in the liturgical drama, a literature was being formed within which were diverse elements from Christian society.”¹⁷ He abandoned the expression in his subsequent lectures in favor of the more inclusive “drame hiératique,” “drame sacerdotale” and “drame ecclésiastique,” and we are left to infer his meaning from the content of his course as a whole. From this perspective, Magnin’s understanding of “drame liturgique” appears quite expansive. He offered a brief glimpse into his conception later in the opening lecture. After summarizing the efforts of the Church to stamp out theater and other spectacles during the early centuries of Christianity, Magnin noted that:

At the same time, the Church made its own call to the dramatic imagination, it instituted representational ceremonies, multiplied processions and the transfers of relics and instituted finally those offices that are true dramas, that of the *Praesepe* or the manger for Christmas, that of the star or the three kings for Epiphany, that

of the sepulcher and the three Marys for Easter, where the three women were represented by three canons who veiled their heads with amices *ad similitudinem mulierum*, as the Ritual says; that of the Ascension, where a priest would represent Christ's ascension, sometimes on the choir screen, sometimes on the outside gallery above a portal; all truly mimetic ceremonies that drew, as we will see, the admiration of the faithful in the Middle Ages.¹⁸

But these *véritables drames* did not arise fully formed, nor were they alone in the panoply of dramatic activities that bubbled up during the long course of early and medieval Christianity. Rather they were, in Magnin's view, the result of dramatic impulses that were evident already in the earliest practices of the Church. In Magnin's reconstruction, the *drame hiératique* emerged over three eras. From the first to sixth centuries, mimetic and sometimes even pagan practices crept into the liturgy in the wake of the receding classical drama, practices that included the dialogue-like songs sung at common meals and dances that were allowed in liturgical processions and around the tombs of martyrs. With the sixth to twelfth centuries came the full flowering of the *génie sacerdotal*, as demonstrated by the performance of masques in convents, by the plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim, and by the representations of the great feast days. The twelfth through the sixteenth centuries saw the escape of the drama from the cloister to the town, where it moved from the control of the Church to the confraternities, and from Latin to the vernacular.¹⁹

Even in those lectures that dealt with specific instances of what we now call "liturgical drama," Magnin's focus shifted from discussions of the so-called plays to sundry other topics large and small, related and seemingly not. He began his discussion of the "true dramas" within the liturgy only in the sixteenth lecture of the first semester (near the end of the term), where he focused on the *Officium Stellae* for Epiphany and the *Officium Pastorum* of Christmas, the earliest of the "true dramas" in his view, having originated during the time of Charlemagne. The topics for the lecture as a whole included:

Eighth and ninth centuries.—Materialization of objects for worship.—Dances in the churches.—Prohibitions of the councils.—Antiphoners.—The claims of Agobard.—Valdamnus.—Christmas carols.—Use of wax for liturgical representations.—Diptychs.—Office of the three Kings or of the Star.—Office of the Shepherds.—Liturgy performed by laity.—Royal feasts.—Charlemagne's moon.—Fairs.—Jongleurs.—Secular works.—National songs.—National festivals at Venice.²⁰

A similar range is evident in the lecture dealing with the *Sponsus* of Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1139, 53v–58v (hereafter Paris 1139), given as the third lecture of the second semester:

Eleventh century—Liturgy mixed with vernacular. Latin is no longer understood by the people—It is preserved by the church.—Lives of the saints.—Farced legend of St. Stephen.—*Versus* in honor of St. Mary.—Mystery of the wise and foolish virgins, preserved in a manuscript of Saint-Martial.—Bas-reliefs and sculptures of the cathedrals.²¹

Magnin argued here that the texts and melodies of the so-called *Sponsus* actually comprised three separate plays (Three Marys, Wise and Foolish Virgins, and Prophet Play) rather than the single play recognized by his predecessors, an argument that has been accepted by most subsequent critics.²² He discerned a fourth play in the manuscript as well (Lamentation of Rachel). Discussing the time he spent with the manuscript in 1835, he described his epiphany a decade later:

I thought I could see, not only as my knowledgeable predecessors had seen, a unique drama or mystery, but three separate and distinct mysteries, namely: first two complete mysteries, one in Latin and one in Latin mixed with the vernacular, and second, a fragment of a mystery totally in Latin. The more I thought about it, I recognized another Latin fragment of a dramatic office or mystery of the Holy Innocents that had not been previously reported.²³

In his second lecture dealing with what we now call the Fleury Playbook,²⁴ given as the sixth lecture of the second semester, Magnin offered a similarly disparate group of topics:

Twelfth century—Beginning of secularization—Albigensian heresies.—Military orders.—Development of hieratic art in sculpture, painting, and tapestries.—Protests on the part of the clergy.—St. Bernard.—Ritual of Saint-Aignan.—The colloquy between Gabriel and Mary.—Monastic liturgy.—Manuscript of Saint-Benoît-sur-Loire.—Mystery of the Conversion of St. Paul.—Mystery of the Resurrection of Lazarus.—Four Miracles of St. Nicholas.²⁵

Ultimately, Magnin was not so much interested in religious or liturgical theater as he was in the development—and the continuation—of what he called the “génie dramatique” during the Middle Ages. For Magnin, drama was not so much reborn as it was lying in wait, emerging intermittently in

various guises until finally awakening as ecclesiastical or hieratic drama. The “génie dramatique” was deeply engrained in human consciousness, and Magnin saw its manifestations persisting despite any and all attempts to deny it:

I believe neither in the revival nor in the sleep of the human faculties; I believe in continuity, in their transformations, especially their perfectibility and progress. I hope to establish by incontrovertible evidence, that is to say by monuments and texts, that the dramatic faculty, as natural to man as the lyric faculty, for example, has never ceased to exist and to occur. No, gentlemen, throughout the long interval of decay and social reconstruction which I must call, like everyone else, the Middle Ages, until we know it well enough to be able to provide a name less vague, for all this long interval, the dramatic genius has not entirely been missing to humanity: the one, the main difficulty for the critic is how to discern it and how to recognize it in the new costumes that dress it and under the thick layer of barbarism that covers and disguises it.²⁶

His focus was thus not so much on individual acts of drama or theater, but rather more generally on medieval forms of expression and representation wherever they might be found, whether in drama *per se* or, as the scope of his lectures reveals, in dance, in sculpture, in tapestries, or even in funeral orations. The “dramatic faculty,” or “dramatic genius,” was for Magnin, an innately human capacity that could ultimately elevate what would become European theater out of the bog of barbarism to which it had been consigned. Indeed, the list of churches whose naves served as stage for the *drame théocratique* cited above went far beyond what was needed to accommodate the true dramas to which he had alluded in his opening lecture. While the *Visitatio Sepulchri*, *Officium Stellae*, and *Officium Pastorum* may have been known in the cathedrals of Strasbourg and Rouen and in the monastery of Saint-Martial, they were certainly not a part of the liturgical fabrics of Hagia Sophia in Byzantium or the church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome. Liturgical drama was not just a collection of representational rites, rites that appeared to have characters, sets, costumes, and staging. Liturgical drama embodied the full range of representational actions that might occur within or adjacent to the rites of the medieval Church. For Magnin, and his immediate successors, the expression “drame liturgique” was a metaphor—the drama in the liturgy, so to speak.

Magnin’s reimagining of theatrical history was revolutionary and its impact may well have been even more profound had he seen his way clear

to complete the ambitious project that he had begun. Indeed, Magnin had intended to offer his findings in a grand history of modern theater, but only one volume of his proposed four-volume study made it to print, and this volume, published in 1838, treated only the theater of the ancient world.²⁷ Magnin was acutely aware of the problems he faced in completing the work, and he lamented in his introduction that so much had changed since his course that only its broadest outline would survive.²⁸ Adolphe-Napoléon Didron, founder and publisher of the journal *Annales archéologiques*, however, was less inclined to sympathy. For him, Magnin's failure to complete was but the inevitable result of Magnin's 1838 entry into the French Academy: "In 1838, M. Magnin entered the Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, where he caught, we fear, the disease of the place, the inactivity, the somnolence."²⁹

In the end, it is remarkable that Magnin was able to make so much of so little. He knew comparatively few examples of what would later be included within the category of liturgical drama. He knew of the manuscripts reported by Lebeuf a century earlier: the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 and what we now call the Fleury Playbook of Orléans 201, and he knew many of the representational rites published in the liturgical collections of Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and Martène a half-century before that.³⁰ All that would soon change, and as newly discovered texts proliferated, Magnin's reimagining of theater history provided a template for understanding the budding repertory for the *drame liturgique* that appeared so clearly correct that none would question its propriety for nearly a century.³¹

In the Wake of Magnin's *Cours* (1835–1847)

The impact of Magnin's course was both immediate and far-reaching. Didron, for one, was so moved by Magnin's lectures that he left Paris the following year on a six-month voyage through southern France in search of further evidence for *le drame* in the remains of medieval churches. Referring to Magnin's lectures a dozen years later, Didron recalled:

I listened to this history with such passion that I have not forgotten its essential outline or its main facts. Freshly nourished by this knowledge from others, so excellent and substantial, I made a six-month journey in 1836 to several provinces of France, and particularly in *le Midi*. Attracted especially to religious monuments and to the carved and painted representations in such monuments, the facts that M. Magnin had outlined in his lessons from the Sorbonne

grew ever more significantly in my mind. They came to mind again and again, and I saw the liturgical dramas about which M. Magnin had spoken for so long in our class at the Faculté actually performed by the characters of sculpture and stained glass.³²

A quarter-century after Magnin's course, Edmond de Coussemaker still felt its impact:

In a memorable course taught in 1835 at the Sorbonne, M. Magnin, from the Institute, revealed for the first time the diverse phases of drama: religious, aristocratic, and popular, from the origin of Christianity to modern times. This course was a veritable revelation. The profound views, the lofty reflections, the ingenious realizations, the multiple analyses, the syntheses so full of wisdom, made these lessons all the more substantial and captivating.³³

While Magnin's contributions would be largely forgotten by the *fin de siècle*, Oscar Cargill could still add to the resonance of Magnin's voice nearly a century later, suggesting that it was Magnin's influence on the younger Victor Hugo that inspired the character of Pierre Gringoire, author of mysteries, in the first chapter of Hugo's *Notre Dame de Paris* (Paris, 1831).³⁴

The decade and a half following Magnin's lectures saw a surge in scholarly activity concerning the *drame liturgique*, especially in the discovery and publication of new sources for medieval Latin drama. Louis-Jean Nicolas Monmerqué published the texts of what we now know as the Fleury Playbook in 1834 along with two additional settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri*,³⁵ and Jacques Joseph Champollion-Figeac offered the three plays of Abelard's student, Hilarius, four years later.³⁶ Thomas Wright brought these texts to the English-speaking world in 1838 in his *Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries*, a volume that included not only the ten "rude dramas" of the Fleury manuscript, but the plays of Hilarius, the Greater Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, and the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 as well.³⁷ Another unknown setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* also found its way into print about the same time. In 1830, Franz Kurz, canon and librarian at the Augustinian monastery of St. Florian (Austria), included a textual edition of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Klosterneuburg as an appendix to his study of Emperor Albrecht V.³⁸

The first transcriptions of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* beyond those published by the liturgists of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and those few published in the 1830s came in 1846 with the pub-

lication of Franz Josef Mone's two-volume *Schauspiele des Mittelalters*.³⁹ Mone, who served as archivist in Karlsruhe, was the first scholar to search through the libraries and archives of Europe for examples of Latin religious drama, adding several settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from manuscripts in the libraries of Karlsruhe, Einsiedeln, and Engelberg to the handful already known from France. Three years later, Édelstand du Méril included Mone's corpus along with all known Latin religious plays in his *Origines latines du théâtre moderne*.⁴⁰ Even though both Mone and du Méril included multiple examples of what we would come to know as liturgical drama, neither used this expression in a descriptive sense, as defining a particular category or genre. Du Méril used the label only in footnotes,⁴¹ while Mone avoided its use altogether. Nevertheless, both authors maintained a distinction between those texts that were performed within the liturgy, i.e., those contained within liturgical books, and those whose liturgical assignments were either missing or unsettled. Mone, for example, used the term "Osterfeier" to refer to settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* and the term "Osterspiel" to refer either to vernacular Easter plays or to those settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* where the liturgical context was not clear.⁴² Du Méril, similarly, used the term "office" to refer to liturgical ceremonies such as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and its siblings from Christmas and Epiphany and "mystère" to refer to those for which evidence for liturgical performance was lacking or unclear.⁴³

Félix Clément and the Drama of the Liturgy (1847–1851)

It is fortuitous that the merger of "liturgy" and "drama" should occur at this moment in French history. The French church was in disarray. Anticlerical fervor had risen yet again in the wake of the July Revolution. In 1831, there were riots at Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois that forced the closing of churches in Paris. The archepiscopal palace near Notre-Dame-de-Paris was destroyed, and the cathedral invaded. Mobs sacked seminaries and bishops' houses in Lille, Nîmes, Dijon, and Angoulême. In Le Mans, demonstrators gathered in the square before the cathedral on the feast of the Assumption to shout "Death to the priests," and the following year a mob desecrated an ancient cross that had stood in Le Mans for centuries.⁴⁴ Liturgy, moreover, had become an ineffectual and largely localized affair with little consistency in practice from one church to the next. The expression of liturgy was for many an afterthought, a requirement with little purpose. In the Church of Sainte-Marguerite in Paris, for example, compline

and vespers were said together, although the office was otherwise rarely said in public having become but “the mechanical duty of a private devotion of the clergy.”⁴⁵ At the church of Saint-Jacques-du-Haut-Pas near the Sorbonne, the Divine Office was suppressed except for that of the church patron, and on Sundays, eleven Masses were celebrated simultaneously in the church’s twelve chapels.⁴⁶

At the same time, the merger of “liturgy” and “drama” could not have found more fertile ground. In the years preceding the July Revolution, beginning in the last decades of the *ancien régime* and resuming under Napoléon, there was a movement among the sophisticates of Paris toward a more theatrical expression of worship. The newer churches of Paris—Sainte-Genviève, Saint-Philippe-du-Roule, and La Madeleine—were modeled on pagan temples and became, in the words of R. W. Franklin, “sacred theatres, great halls of marble and gold, often including galleries and boxes,” expressing “the idea that the liturgy was holy drama to be performed by ecclesiastical actors on a stage raised and separated from the passive audience below.”⁴⁷ The sense of spectacle was even more pronounced at the royal chapel at Versailles, which served as:

a morning counterpart of the opera next door. A court mass was similar to a soirée, often including a divertissement by Lully, and the congregation sometimes faced the orchestra and not the altar. French piety greeted Christ as a divine king within the monstrance or visited him as the suffering prisoner of the tabernacle. The mass-liturgy was understood as a collection of rubrics, compulsory ceremonial for proper reception of a heavenly monarch. The liturgical text was smothered under the weight of profane polyphony; and fashionable masses, surrounded with lights, jewels, singers, pageantry, were “church concerts with liturgical accompaniment.”⁴⁸

The appointment of Jean-François Lesueur as musical director of the Tuileries chapel in 1804 brought a flood of operatically inspired works for singers and orchestra, including oratorios, Masses, motets, and cantatas, which only increased in intensity with the appointment in 1816 of Luigi Cherubini as co-director. Until it was sacked during the July Revolution of 1830, the Tuileries chapel stood as the most important institution for sacred music in France, with nearly one hundred singers and instrumentalists in its employ.⁴⁹

It was against this backdrop that the expression “drame liturgique” came to be, a backdrop where the church and stage could serve as one in some quarters while fully divorced in others. The disarray of liturgical

practice and understanding, the disassociation of liturgy from religiosity, the yearning for both a more pure and at the same time more meaningful, indeed dramatic, liturgical expression set the stage for a liturgical reform that would by the end of the nineteenth century take hold of the Church at large, and in so doing helped to solidify the notion “drame liturgique” in both the scholarly and popular imaginations.

The expression “drame liturgique” made its way fully into the scholarly lexicon with a series of essays by Félix Clément, organist for the Collège Stanislas and the Sorbonne and one of the leading voices for liturgical reform among French church musicians. Between 1847 and 1851, Clément published a serialized study on liturgical drama in Adolph-Napoléon Didron’s *Annales archéologiques*. Originally entitled “Liturgie, musique, et drame au Moyen Âge,” the title was changed midway through 1848 to “Drame liturgique.”⁵⁰ According to Didron’s introduction, the article’s intent was to cover the subject of liturgical drama for the entire church year, including the feasts for the saints. Moreover, the installments were scheduled to coincide with the feasts of the liturgical year, the installment for Advent and Christmas appearing in December 1847, that for Epiphany, in January 1848, and that for Ash Wednesday in February 1848. In the wake of the Revolution of 1848 in late February, however, the journal switched to a predominantly bi-monthly publication and such coordination ceased. Clément’s study dragged out another three years without moving beyond the liturgy of the time.

His title notwithstanding, Clément was not particularly interested in liturgical drama as we might characterize it. Like Magnin before him, Clément saw the notion of “drame liturgique” as metaphor.⁵¹ His use of the metaphor, though, was more polemical than descriptive. At twenty-five years of age, Clément was fast becoming one of the leading ultramontanes of his generation, seeking both to restore the texts and music of the medieval liturgy into contemporary usage and to impose this usage on the Church as a whole. The ultramontanes, including Clément, Alexandre-Étienne Choron, Félix Danjou, Joseph d’Ortigue, and other similarly inclined church musicians, served as the lay counterpart to the more scholarly, and ultimately more successful, monks of Solesmes under the leadership of Dom Prosper Guéranger in their efforts to return the chant to its medieval splendor in opposition to the neo-Gallican chant reforms that had held sway in France since the late seventeenth century.⁵² Clément’s concern thus was not with liturgical drama in the current sense of the expression, but with the dramatic sweep of the medieval liturgy as a whole.

His study, in fact, was an *apologia* for the medieval Mass as it progressed from Advent through Pentecost as set out largely in a single, unidentified gradual from the thirteenth century.⁵³ While this gradual included the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter Sunday, the *Officium Pastorum* of Christmas, and the *Officium Stellae* of Epiphany, Clément treated these rites only in passing. With missionary zeal, he focused his discussion instead on the dramatic nature of the Mass liturgy as a whole, and he argued for its superiority over the tepid liturgical practices of his own time. He devoted the bulk of his attention not to what we might consider to be liturgical drama, but to what he saw as the highly expressive, and even dramatic, poetry and music of proses, tropes, and hymns. Indeed, Clément included but two musical examples within his study, neither of which are liturgical dramas as currently reckoned: a harmonized setting of the sequence, *Qui regis sceptris*, for the third Sunday in Advent (3 voices plus organ accompaniment)⁵⁴ and a monophonic setting of the troped *Kyrie fons bonitatis*.⁵⁵

While Magnin sought to track the rise of modern theater from its chaotic medieval beginnings to a more perfect present, Clément sought perfection in the past itself.⁵⁶ For Clément, the contrast between old and new was striking and the superiority of the old over the new, self-evident. In his discussion of the liturgy for the feast of the Circumcision, for example, he compared a *versiculus* used at vespers in an unidentified thirteenth-century manuscript from Sens with a hymn from an eighteenth-century French breviary. Concerning the thirteenth-century text, *Trinitas, deitas, unitas*,⁵⁷ he remarked:

Such grandeur! such lavish enumeration! such sonority! The thought of the Middle Ages is wholly captured in this poetry with its originality and its boldness. The musical expression rises or moderates according to the force of the images; it arrives at its paroxysm when it expresses these words: “Tu Theos et heros, dives flos, vivens ros, rege nos, salva nos, perduc nos ad Thronos superos et vera gaudia.” That is only one example among thousands of the marvelous fruitfulness of the poets of the thirteenth century.⁵⁸

His view of the contemporary hymn, *Debilis cessent elementa legis*⁵⁹ was less generous: “Everyone, children, men, even women, foreigners for the most part to Latin, will be struck by the rhythm, the sonorous articulations of our thirteenth-century hymn; while that which replaced it could be appreciated at most by a few professors of rhetoric.”⁶⁰ He then asked rhetorically:

On which side was true poetry, the true intelligence of Christian art? Was it in this noble, grand, and fruitful series of verses [of the thirteenth-century *versiculus*], or in this weak quatrain, half poetic, half philosophical, whose words, scattered by the requirements of meter, chase one another around the page like fragments of a sliced-up snake. What did these intruders bring to Christian liturgy, these sapphic, adonic verses, with their heavy feet, anapestic and bacchic?⁶¹

The modern hymn, for Clément, was simply barbaric: “Why not go back to worshipping Jupiter and Saturn?”⁶²

On the music itself, Clément was equally effusive about medieval practice while disparaging of the modern. In his essay on Ash Wednesday and Lent, he noted with regard to contemporary efforts at chant composition:

How can anyone claim that the men responsible for all these things have done justice to the chant? Not only have they mutilated and rendered it almost unrecognizable, but again, while no longer understanding it, they invented absolute systems based on imaginary or fortuitous connections. In short, unable to understand the old chant, they have invented a new one, and the very least damage they caused was to prevent composers from writing plainsong at all. Who among them, in fact, has become subject to this morass of rules that are not justified by the monuments. No one has done so at any time, and no one else will. The chant of the Middle Ages, like all art, is nothing less than encyclopedic.⁶³

For Clément, there was no questioning the primacy of medieval liturgical practice over the modern. The art of the Middle Ages was something to strive toward, not to rebel against, and he used the expression “drame liturgique” to accentuate that fundamental aspect of medieval liturgical poetry and music that distinguished it from the tepid practices to which the church musicians of nineteenth-century France had become accustomed. He had little interest in what the expression “liturgical drama” would later come to represent. His focus was on the drama *of* the liturgy, not the drama *in* the liturgy.

“Liturgical Drama” at Mid-Century (1848–1860)

Interest in the newly identified drama of the medieval Church continued to grow throughout the 1840s and 1850s. In 1848, Félix Danjou, another of the ultramontanes and publisher of the journal *Revue de musique religieuse*, provided a musical edition of the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus*, then in private hands.⁶⁴ In 1852, Edmond de Coussemaker included a facsimile, transcription and analysis of the so-called plays of Paris 1139 in his book, *Histoire de l'harmonie au moyen âge*.⁶⁵ The transcription of the text and a facsimile of the *Ludus Paschalis* of Tours was published by Victor Luzarche in 1856,⁶⁶ and in 1858, Coussemaker provided a textual edition of the macaronic *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the convent of Origny-Sainte-Benoîte.⁶⁷

The first encyclopedia article on “Drame liturgique” appeared in 1854 in the *Dictionnaire liturgique* of Joseph d’Ortigue, which was drawn primarily from the chapter on the plays of Paris 1139 included in Coussemaker’s *Histoire de l’harmonie*.⁶⁸ That same year, Jules comte de Douhet included a series of articles on the plays of the Fleury manuscript, on the plays of Hilarius, and on the representational offices of Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter in his *Dictionnaire des mystères*, avoiding the expression “liturgical drama” (*drame liturgique*) in favor of the more general and somewhat more accurate “figural representations in the ecclesiastical rites” (*représentations figurées dans les rites ecclésiastiques*) or “figural rites” (*rites figurées*).⁶⁹ In 1860, Félix Clément extended his earlier discussion on the *drame liturgique* in his *Histoire générale de la musique religieuse*. In the chapter on *Drame liturgique* (easily the longest in the book), he not only retrod the ground he had covered over a decade earlier, but added new sections on the Marian feasts and on the feast of Thomas Becket.⁷⁰ Clément’s take on “liturgical drama” did not diverge from that of his earlier study, though, and his focus remained in these new sections on the music associated with liturgical poetry rather than on anything that we might see as liturgical drama.

The picture at mid-century was thus confused. On the one hand, a consensus was building for a category that encompassed two different kinds of apparently dramatic events: a specific group of liturgical offices for Christmas, Epiphany, and Easter that appeared self-evidently mimetic (Mone’s “Osterfeiern,” du Méril’s “offices” and Douhet’s “rites figurées”) along with what appeared to be religious plays that were sung in Latin, plays that might have been liturgical but that lacked any clear liturgical connec-

tions (Mone's "Osterspiele" and du Méril's and Douhet's "mystères"). The expression "drame liturgique," however, was directed toward a wider array of ritual activities, any of which could be described as potentially dramatic whether properly "drama" (by whatever definition) or not.

This expansive understanding of "drame liturgique" was best expressed by Didron himself, who mused that had he the time he would have written such a book on the subject, and he would have given it the title "Dramatic Liturgy, or Liturgical Drama in the Middle Ages."⁷¹ Other writers, both near to and far from the study of medieval theater, took to this reading as well. In 1839, Édouard de Bazelaire, in a youthful essay on the last of the mysteries, commented on "the *Kyrieles* [i.e., the processional litanies] of Remiremont, the procession of Reynard [the Fox], the burial of the Mardi Gras, the travesties with animals of all kinds, the thousand follies that we can see in the glossary of Du Cange," noting that "this shamelessness of mind lasted long enough, but about the fourteenth century, the improving standard and refining ideas drove out sacrilegious jokes, and primitive symbols themselves gave way to a more spiritual way of thinking. These liturgical dramas, expelled from the church, ascended the stage, and as the ancient theater in times past emerged from the Eleusinian mysteries."⁷²

If Bazelaire's understanding of "drame liturgique" echoed that of Magnin, Paul Scudo stretched the metaphor yet further in his 1857 biographical novel on the life and works of composer Giuseppe Sarti. In describing performance of Sarti's sacred works, for example, Scudo noted several symphonic interludes that had the effect of "pleasantly suspending the action of the liturgical drama."⁷³ In discussing the music of Palestrina, Scudo extended the metaphor yet again, noting that "the absolute merit of the works of Palestrina . . . has effected all parts of the liturgical drama."⁷⁴

"Liturgical Drama" as Category: Cousse-maker, Sepet, and Gautier (1860–1872)

As well entrenched as this metaphorical reading of "drame liturgique" appeared to be, its hold was weak, and with the 1860 publication of Edmond de Cousse-maker's *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Âge*, it was largely abandoned in favor of the genre that remains with us today. Nearly two centuries after Le Brun des Marettes had offered musical editions for the *Officium Stellae* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the cathedral of Rouen, Cousse-maker provided musical editions and scholarly treatments for

twenty-two so-called liturgical dramas. More significantly, he transformed the way that the expression “drame liturgique” came to be understood.

Coussemaker was one of the great polymaths in a century of polymaths. A performer, composer, musicologist, ethnologist, jurist, and champion of Flemish culture in France, Coussemaker studied music in his youth and went on to study law in Paris.⁷⁵ He continued his study of music and his research into its history while also serving as an advocate in Douai (1830) and later as justice of the peace for Bailleul (1836), and judge for Bergues (1843), Hazebrouk (1845), Dunkerque (1852), and Lille (1858). As a musicologist and ethnologist, he was prolific, particularly considering the demands of his legal career. In addition to his book on liturgical drama and a great many articles, he published on a number of different subjects, including several books on medieval musical theory,⁷⁶ the works of Adam de la Halle,⁷⁷ and popular song in French Flanders.⁷⁸

For Coussemaker, “drame liturgique” was not a metaphorical abstraction. It was a categorical descriptor. Expanding the distinction made by du Ménil a decade earlier, Coussemaker saw two types of religious drama during the Middle Ages: liturgical dramas and mysteries. While based on the same subject matter, these types were completely different: “The liturgical dramas were those bound in an intimate way to the ceremonies of worship, having developed from the liturgy of the time and of the saints. . . . The mysteries were represented in a theater itself and by lay actors.”⁷⁹ The *dramas liturgiques*, moreover, could themselves be subdivided:

Independently of the differences that existed between the liturgical dramas and the mysteries, it is necessary also to distinguish among the liturgical dramas themselves. These were of two types. The one was bound closely to the religious ceremonies and formed, to some extent, a unit with them by borrowing the liturgical texts that were paraphrased and put into dialogue that required action. The others, while having the same religious character, did not have such an intimate connection with the ritual. They were dramatic at their creation. They have as their subject the sacred text, but their development made them into special compositions whose extent made it impossible to be kept in the offices.⁸⁰

The impact of Coussemaker’s study, like that of Magnin’s a generation earlier, was profound. Coussemaker brought to his inquiry into liturgical drama not only a deep knowledge of the musical and liturgical practice of the Middle Ages at a time when such studies were in their infancy, he

brought also a jurist's insistence on evidence and, to a lesser extent, precision in the use of terms. Eschewing the metaphor "drame liturgique," he pinned the expression to a definable collection of liturgical actions, actions that could by anyone's reckoning be considered as drama. It is unfortunate, therefore, that Coussemaker did not carry these distinctions forward into his discussions of the individual works that he included in his edition, and we are left to divine for ourselves which of his examples belong to one type of liturgical drama or the other.

In the wake of Coussemaker's edition, the expression "drame liturgique" became ubiquitous, at least among French-speaking scholars, and its scope settled within the boundaries that Coussemaker had suggested.⁸¹ While the field of rites, ceremonies, and other activities covered by the rubric was constrained to those most demonstrably mimetic, the distinction claimed by Coussemaker between *mystères* and *dramas liturgique* did not hold. Even Coussemaker could not maintain the distinction, intermixing the expressions in his discussions of individual texts.⁸² In his discussion of the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Paris 1139, for example, he noted that "This mystery had its origin in the catholic liturgy. It is therefore a true liturgical drama."⁸³

Marius Sepet used the expressions interchangeably in his study of the "Prophètes du Christ" in 1867 as well, and he included under their rubric settings of the *Officium Pastorum* and *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Rouen and elsewhere along with the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Saint-Martial. While he conflated the usage of "mystère" and "drame liturgique," Sepet saw the divisions among the *dramas liturgiques* in much the same way as had Coussemaker, reserving the expression "drame liturgique" (or "mystère liturgique") for dramatic ceremonies whose position within the liturgy was fixed and "drame semi-liturgique" or ("mystère semi-liturgique") for those whose position was variable, if known at all. Comparing what he felt to be the fixed liturgical position of the *Ordo Prophetarum* of Paris 1139 with the the moveable placement of the *Processionarum Asinorum* of Rouen, for example, Sepet noted that:

The more or less obligatory character of the dramas that had a place in the liturgy is one of nuances, often difficult to grasp, that serve to distinguish the liturgical mystery of this type of transition to which I, as the first, believed I had to impose the name semi-liturgical mystery, thus indicating a mixture, a compromise, if you will, where again are merged worship and that which is truly drama, although the latter tends visibly to emancipate itself and to break the ties that hold it in the heart of the liturgy where it was born.⁸⁴

Sepet continued this line of reasoning in his discussions of the Beauvais *Danielis Ludus* and the *Jeu d'Adam* of Tours, which, although still associated with the liturgy in his view, were even less securely bound to it.⁸⁵

Léon Gautier, in his 1872 article on the origins of modern theater,⁸⁶ also used the labels “mystère” and “drame liturgique” interchangeably, and, like Sepet, he used these terms in the narrow sense suggested by Coussemaker. However, Gautier expanded the two-part division of the *drame liturgique* framed by Coussemaker and Sepet into seven *degrés* spread over three epochs, prepending to this a preliminary form, a proto-drama, represented in the tropes for Christmas and Easter.⁸⁷

“Liturgical Drama” Outside of France (1847–1933)

The idea of liturgical drama was a product of French literary and musical scholarship. Outside of France, scholars were noncommittal, and acceptance of the new notion was scattered at best. Mid-nineteenth-century scholars in Britain and America in particular appear to have been puzzled by this new notion, and what little interest existed was held by antiquarians and by students of the liturgy. As late as 1847, the playwright George Soane, in his discussion of customs formerly observed in the British Isles for the celebration of Easter, still spoke in terms reminiscent of sixteenth-century Protestant reformers, seeing the *Visitatio Sepulchri* and other rites as curiosities and follies that were themselves little different from the theater: “In the times of Roman Catholic predominance, the church celebrated the day with many pageants that differed little from those of the theatre, except in being less amusing and less rational. Amongst other follies we are told, that as on the previous evenings the watching of the sepulchre had been acted, so upon this day the resurrection was represented. The form of the ceremony varied as to details in different places, though substantially the same in all countries.”⁸⁸

Two years later, Fr. Daniel Rock granted the notion (if not the label) of liturgical drama in his study of the rites of Salisbury cathedral, acknowledging in a footnote on liturgical interludes that:

There were two kinds of sacred plays; of the first, which may be called liturgical, were such as the younger clergy acted with much ritual solemnity at church during service, and were meant to set before the people’s eyes in a strong light some portion of Holy Writ which spoke of the mystery commemorated in that festival.

. . . Of the first or liturgical sort of representation, traces may be found in the Anglo-Saxon ritual; St. Dunstan especially lays down the rubric for the one exhibited upon Easter morning, and which was kept up in this country till it changed its religion.⁸⁹

In the third volume of the same study, though, Rock introduced the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* without reference to any purported dramatic intent: “Easter Sunday had one rite which exclusively belonged to itself, and consisted in showing how the two Mariés and Salome made their sunrise Visit to the Sepulchre of our Lord.”⁹⁰

It was only in the latter part of the nineteenth century that the expression “liturgical drama” was taken up by literary scholars in Britain and America. As late as 1875, Adolphus Ward could claim that there was “No drama in England before the Norman Conquest,” and he had nothing to say about the so-called liturgical dramas that had been accumulating in the literature since the 1830s.⁹¹ In 1887, however, Francis H. Stoddard, instructor in English literature at the University of California, provided numerous references for the “Latin Liturgical Drama” in his bibliography of medieval miracle plays and mysteries.⁹² By the turn of the twentieth century the expression would become as commonplace in English as it was in French, with numerous references in the monumental studies of both Edmond K. Chambers⁹³ and Karl Young.⁹⁴

The expression did not translate well into German, however. Of the several scholars who treated the religious drama of the Middle Ages during the latter half of the nineteenth century in German-speaking Europe, only Robert Pröhl found use for the expression or its equivalent (“kirchlichen Spiele”).⁹⁵ While some musicologists did find use for the expression,⁹⁶ for literary and theater scholars, the expressions used were either more general: “Schauspiele” or “geistliche Schauspiele,”⁹⁷ “lateinisches Kirchendrama,”⁹⁸ or more particular: “liturgisch-dramatische Auferstehungsfeier”⁹⁹ and “Weihnachtsspiele” or “Osternachtsfeiern.”¹⁰⁰ Beginning with the study of Gustav Milchsack in 1880¹⁰¹ and continuing with those of Carl Lange in 1881 and 1887,¹⁰² most subsequent German-speaking scholars avoided the broader categories altogether, choosing to focus instead on individual forms, the *Osterfeiern* and *Osterspiele* in particular.

The creation of the metaphor “liturgical drama” in 1834 enabled the comingling of an assortment of both liturgical and non-liturgical actions that could be regarded as drama according to the way that nineteenth-century scholars tended to understand that term. As the collection grew, the metaphor crystallized into category, and the expression “liturgical drama” became a term of art that brought together under a single banner two very different kinds of activities. It was not the collection that defined the genre, but the other way around. The neologism spawned the collection that would gather around it. Indeed, this union of “liturgical” and “dramatic” was a novelty, and it would change the way that nearly all scholars approached the study of medieval drama thereafter. But this new notion was not without difficulties. As the nineteenth century gave way to the twentieth, and as the language of scholarship moved from French to English to German, the notion was slowly but inexorably ground down by a succession of scholars over the generations that followed.

NOTES

¹ Magnin’s course began with the start of the first semester on December 1, 1834 with lectures scheduled at 9:30 (am) on Mondays and Fridays (*Journal générale de l’Instruction publique* 4 [1834], 36). The second semester likely met even earlier. In his review of Magnin’s *Cours*, Achille Jubinal complained of the “inconvenience of having taken place at eight in the morning and in the depths of the old Sorbonne, that is, at one of the extremities of Paris” (inconvenient d’avoir eu lieu à huit heures du matin et au fond de l’antique Sorbonne, c’est-à-dire à l’une des extrémités de Paris). Jubinal, “Cours de M. Charles Magnin,” 1:313.

² The chair of foreign literature was held by Claude-Charles Fauriel, for whom the position had been created in 1830. Fauriel used this respite to complete his *Histoire de la Gaule méridionale*, the middle part of a three-part general history of southern France that he had intended to write but did not complete. Fauriel’s work focused largely on Provençal poetry. His lectures from 1831–1832 were published posthumously as *Histoire de la poésie provençale*.

³ Sainte-Beuve, “Écrivains critiques . . . Charles Magnin” (1843). Sainte-Beuve’s second essay came after Magnin’s death in 1862: Sainte-Beuve, “Un érudit écrivain: M. Charles Magnin.”

⁴ Paris, “Discours de M. Paulin Paris.”

⁵ Wallon, “Notice sur la vie.” While neither a musician nor a musicologist, Magnin had at least a tangential relationship with some of the more notable musical figures of that era as well. When the Paris Conservatoire suspected that its former librarian, François Fétis, had stolen its materials, Charles Magnin was called in to help recover them. See Lesure, “L’affaire Fétis.” As a critic, moreover,

Magnin was intimately involved with the performances of Shakespeare led in Paris by Charles Kemble during the 1827–1828 season, and he was particularly taken with the performances of Harriet Smithson, who would inspire Hector Berlioz's *Symphonie fantastique* and who would become the composer's wife. On Magnin's influence as a theater critic, particularly with reference to the performances of Shakespeare in Paris in 1827–1828, see Borgerhoff, *Le théâtre anglais à Paris* and Elliott, "The Shakespeare Berlioz Saw."

⁶ "C'eût été, il y a vingt ans, un étonnement général, si l'on eût vu paraître un gros volume ayant pour titre comme celui-ci: Théâtre français au Moyen Âge, pendant les XIe, XIIe, XIIIe et XIVe siècles. Il était alors universellement admis que le berceau du théâtre en France ne remontait guère au delà des représentations données par les Confrères au bourg de Saint-Maur, vers 1398, et à Paris, dans une salle de l'hôpital de la Trinité en 1402." Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 5–6

⁷ "Il y a à peine vingt-cinq ans, on croyait encore, avec Beauchamps et les frères Parfait, qui l'art dramatique moderne ne datait pas d'une époque antérieure au quatorzième siècle. Il semblait du moins avoir sommeillé pendant bien longtemps, lorsque cette branche de littérature et d'archéologie nationale, comme plusieurs autres demeurées trop longtemps dans l'oubli, attira enfin l'attention des savants." Coussemaker, "Drame liturgique," 197. Coussemaker refers here to Beauchamps, *Recherches sur les théâtres de France* (1735–1740) and Parfait, *Histoire du théâtre françois* (1734–1749). On Coussemaker's article and the book from which it was drawn, see n. 58.

⁸ Until recently, Oscar Cargill was the only scholar to offer a critical assessment of Magnin's approach to the history of drama. He was particularly disparaging of Magnin's attempt to draw parallels between the history of modern drama and that of the ancients: "Magnin writes: 'Things came to pass in the Middle Ages in the same manner as they did in antiquity. . . . The modern theater received, just as did that of antiquity, its first development in the ritual, hence it is necessary to subordinate in our researches the history of the aristocratic and popular drama to that of the ecclesiastical drama.' Nearly every critic since Magnin has borrowed this same dangerous analogy." Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 7. A more recent assessment of Magnin's work has been offered by Petersen, "The Concept of Liturgical Drama: Coussemaker and Magnin."

⁹ Manly, "Literary Forms." On Manly's contribution, see chapter 2, p. 55–56.

¹⁰ "le théâtre religieux, merveilleux, théocratique, le grand théâtre, qui a eu pour scène au moyen-âge les nefs de Sainte-Sophie, de Sainte-Marie-Majeure, les cathédrales de Strasbourg, de Rouen, de Rheims, de Cambrai, les monastères de Corbie, de Saint-Martial, de Gandersheim, de Saint-Alban." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹¹ "la théâtre seigneurial et royal, qui brilla aux palais des ducs de Provence, de Normandie, de Bretagne et d'Aquitaine, aux donjons des comptes de Champagne, aux châteaux des sires de Coucy, aux fêtes des rois de France et d'Angleterre, à la

cour de l'Empereur, aux galas des rois de Sicile et d'Aragon." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹² "le théâtre populaire et forain, qu'on vit constamment à de certains jours, s'agiter et s'abattre, à grand renfort de bruit et de gaité, dans les places de Florence, sur les quais et les canaux de Venise, dans les carrefours de Londres et de Paris." Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre," 585.

¹³ Charles Magnin, "Cours Publics." A manuscript copy of the article is available in the New York Public Library under the shelfmark: "Magnin Papers." The title page reads: "Origines du théâtre moderne. Cours professé à la Sorbonne par M. Charles Magnin pendant l'année scolaire 1834–35. (Copie textuelle de Compte rendu inséré dans les T. IV et V des *Journal général de l'Instruction publique*). Beauvais. Janvier 1850." While the catalogue entry for this manuscript claims it to be the "lecture notes compiled by Magnin from a course of study at the Sorbonne, 1834–35, which constitute the source materials he used to write *Les Origines du théâtre moderne* 1838" along with "transcripts by Magnin of reviews of his book," this is likely not the case. This manuscript contains a copy of the notes to Magnin's lectures as printed in the *Journal générale de l'Instruction publique* made some fifteen years after the fact, along with other items, including several book reviews by Magnin (and not reviews of his book). The text of the "Magnin Cours" is copied by several hands and is written exclusively on the recto side of the page, with numerous additions and corrections on the facing versos. Included among these are quotations from other Magnin essays published before 1850 (see n. 14) that clarify or amplify the material in the notes for the *Cours*. The manuscript contains also the outlines for two books published between 1834 and 1850: Monmerqué and Michel, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* and du Ménil, *Origines latines*. The provenance of the manuscript is unknown. It entered the manuscript division of the New York Public Library in 1959, having been transferred from the Printed Book Division where it had likely been misfiled (information on the provenance of the manuscript was communicated via email by Megan O'Shea, Manuscripts and Archives Division, New York Public Library, Nov. 21, 2007).

¹⁴ Magnin, "Des origines du théâtre;" Magnin, "La comédie au IVe siècle;" Magnin, "Études sur les origines;" Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge*; and Magnin, Review of *Drames liturgiques*. An incomplete list of Magnin's publications is given in Wallon, "Notice sur la vie," 137–40.

¹⁵ While Magnin had used the phrase "théâtre liturgique" as early as 1827, his use of the expression was directed more toward religious drama generally rather than toward what we know as liturgical drama specifically. See Magnin, Review of *Résumé de l'histoire littéraire*. This review was revised and reprinted in Magnin, *Causeries et méditations* as "Du théâtre en Portugal," where the phrase "théâtre liturgique" was changed to "drame liturgique."

¹⁶ "succédaient elles-mêmes à d'autres bien plus solennelles et plus graves, véritables drames liturgiques, approuvés par la papauté et par les conciles, admis dans les diurnaux et dans les rituels, joués et chantés aux processions et dans les

cathedrals.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 582.

¹⁷ “En effet, pendant que l’esprit humain se développait graduellement au sein du clergé dans le drame liturgique, il se fondait une littérature avec des éléments divers de la société chrétienne.” “Magnin Cours” 4/29 (8 Feb. 1835): 135 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 70r).

¹⁸ “En même temps, l’église faisait de son côté appel à l’imagination dramatique, elle instituait des cérémonies figuratives, multipliait les processions et les translations de reliques et instituait enfin ces offices qui sont de véritables drames, celui du *Praesepe* ou de la crèche à Noël, celui de l’étoile ou des trois rois à l’Épiphanie, celui du sépulcre et des trois Maries à Pâques, où les trois saintes femmes étaient représentées par trois chanoines la tête voilée de leur aumusse *ad similitudinem mulierum*, comme dit le Rituel; celui de l’Ascension où l’on voyait quelquefois sur le jubé, quelquefois sur la galerie extérieure, au-dessus de portail, un prêtre représenter l’ascension du Christ; toutes cérémonies vraiment mimiques, qui ont fait, comme nous le verrons, l’admiration de fidèles au moyen-âge.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 589–90. Magnin’s reference to what we now know as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter was likely drawn either from the setting of the office from Rouen given in the second edition (1679) of Le Prévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 211–15, edited and enlarged by Le Brun des Marettes (reprinted in PL 147:139–42) or that found in the article “Sepulchri officium” in du Cange, *Glossarium* 3:814–15 of 1678. The transcriptions by Le Brun des Marettes and du Cange of this office are the only settings of those conceivably known by Magnin that included the phrase “ad similitudinem mulierum.” Le Brun des Marettes was also the first to provide musical transcriptions of this office and of the Rouen *Officium Stellae*. It would be nearly two centuries before Edmond de Coussemaker would become the second. See the discussion of Coussemaker’s contribution below (pp. 33–35). For the other settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* known at the time of Magnin’s lectures, see n. 30.

¹⁹ Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 591–92.

²⁰ “Huitième et neuvième siècles.—Matérialisation des objets du culte.—Danses dans les églises.—Défenses des conciles.—Antiphoniers.—Réclamations d’Agobard.—Valdiamnus.—Chants de Noël.—Emploi de la cire pour les représentations liturgiques.—Diptyques.—Office des trois Rois ou de l’Étoile.—L’office des pasteurs.—Liturgies exécutées par des laïcs.—Fêtes royales.—Lune de Charlemagne.—Foire.—Jongleurs.—Pièces laïques.—Chants nationaux.—Fêtes nationales à Venise.” “Magnin Cours” 4/52 (30 Apr. 1835): 245 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 143r). For both offices, Magnin cited manuscripts from the cathedral at Rouen as given by Le Brun des Marettes in the second edition of Le Prévôt, *Joannis Abricensis Episcopi*, 206–10 (PL 147:135–40) from 1679 and from Martène, *Tractatus*, 87 and 111–12 from 1706. The Rouen rites were republished in Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus*, 3:96 and 3:122–23 from 1736–38 and in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788. The settings of the various dramatic offices from an unknown (and presumably lost) ordinal from Rouen found

their way also into the *Glossarium* of du Cange. These are presented in the following articles: “Pastorum officium” (3:186–87), “Peregrinorum officium” (3:241), “Sepulchri officium” (3:814–15), and “Stellae festum” (3:956–57). See Karl Young, “A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen,” 24–27. On Martène’s sources in particular, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique*, 243. See also n. 30.

²¹ “Onzième siècle.—Liturgie mêlée de langue vulgaires. Le latin n’est plus compris du peuple.—Il est conservé par l’Église.—Vies des Saints.—Légende farcie de S. Étienne.—Versus sainte Marie.—Mystère des vierges folles et des vierges sages, tiré de manuscrit de S. Martial.—Bas reliefs et sculptures de cathédrales.” “Magnin Cours” 4/77 (26 Jul. 1835): 395 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 213r). This play, or series of plays, was first noted by Lebeuf in 1741 in his *Dissertation sur l’histoire*, 2:65 and first published in 1817 by Raynouard, *Choix des poésies originales*, 2:139–43.

²² Magnin’s most thorough defense for this thesis was given in his review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 76–93. Challenging Magnin’s division, Symes, “The Appearance,” 794–801, argues that this was likely a single play and not the three discerned by Magnin and his successors.

²³ “Je crus y apercevoir, non pas seulement, comme mes savants prédécesseurs, un drame ou un mystère unique, mais bien trois mystères séparés et distincts, a savoir: 1e deux mystères complets, l’un tout en latin et l’autre en latin mêlé de langue romane; 2e un fragment de mystère tout latin. De plus je crus reconnaître un autre fragment latin d’un office dramatique ou mystères des Innocents, que l’on n’avait pas signalé jusque-là.” Magnin, Review of *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1846): 77.

²⁴ Orléans, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 201, pp. 176–243 (hereafter Orléans 201). The expression “Fleury Playbook” was likely coined in 1903 by Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:59 and 61. A decade and a half earlier, Francis Stoddard noted that this manuscript was generally known at that time as the “St. Benoit MS.” Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, 22. The collection of plays contained within the manuscript was first noted in 1729 by Lebeuf, “Remarques envoyée d’Auxerre,” 2981–93. This essay included a textual transcription of *Tres Clerici*. In a second essay published six years later, “Lettre d’un solitaire,” 698–708, Lebeuf included a partial transcription of the text of *Tres Filiae* and a discussion of the *Iconia Sancti Nicolai*. The musicological contributions of Jean Lebeuf are treated in Aubry, *La musicologie médiévale*, 31–43. The Fleury manuscript was noted also in the 1776 octavo abridgement of du Cange’s *Glossarium* for the word “Hacla”: “HACLA, genus vestis. Liber Repraesentationum Historicarum in MS. Floriacensi XIII Saeculi, in Repraesentatione Peregrinorum Emmaus; Accedat quidam alius in similitudine Domini, hacla vestitus et tunica.” Du Cange and Carpentier, *Glossarium*, 4:5. The ten plays contained within the manuscript were first edited in 1834 by Monmerqué in his “Mysteria et miracula.” According to Thomas Wright, only thirty copies of Monmerqué’s

edition were printed. The texts were edited again four years later from Monmerqué's uncorrected proofs in Wright's, *Early Mysteries*, 1–53. See also Wright's introduction to the manuscript on pp. vi–vii and the notes to his edition on pp. 124–26. The notice from du Cange is given also by Wright, *Early Mysteries*, 125.

²⁵ “Douzième siècle.—Commencement de sécularisation.—Hérésies des albigeois.—Ordres militaires.—Développement de l'art hiératique dans la sculpture, la peinture, les tapisseries.—Protestation d'une partie de clergé.—S. Bernard.—Rituel de S. Aignan.—Colloquium entre Gabriel et Marie.—Liturgies monastiques.—Manuscrit de S. Benôit-sur-Loire.—Mystère de la Conversion de St. Paul.—Mystère de la Résurrection de Lazare. Quatre Miracles de S. Nicolas.” “Magnin Cours” 4/91 (13 Sep. 1835): 478 (NYPL, Magnin Papers, 233r). Magnin limited his discussion here to the Conversion of St. Paul, the Resurrection of Lazarus, and the four plays of St. Nicholas, having treated the plays of the Christmas and Easter seasons in the second lecture of the second semester.

²⁶ “Je ne crois ni au réveil ni au sommeil des facultés humaines; je crois à la continuité, à leurs transformations, surtout à leur perfectibilité et à leurs progrès. J'espère établir par des preuves irréfragables, c'est-à-dire par des monumens et par des textes, que la faculté dramatique, aussi naturelle à l'homme que la faculté lyrique, par exemple, n'a jamais cessé d'exister et de se produire. Non, messieurs, pendant tout ce long intervalle de décomposition et de recomposition sociale, qu'il me faut bien appeler, comme tout le monde, le moyen-âge, jusqu'à ce qu'on le connaisse assez bien pour lui pouvoir donner un nom moins vague, pendant tout ce long intervalle, le génie dramatique n'a pas manqué tout à fait à l'humanité: la seule, la grande difficulté pour le critique est de savoir le discerner et le reconnaître sous les nouvelles apparences qu'il revêt, et sous la couche épaisse de barbarie qui le recouvre et le déguise.” Magnin, “Des origines du théâtre,” 580–81.

²⁷ Magnin, *Les origines du théâtre moderne*. While he did not complete his study of the origins of modern theater, he did publish two major studies on other subjects in subsequent years, including a study and translation of the plays of Hrosvitha of Gandersheim: Magnin, *Théâtre de Hrosvitha* (1845) and a study on the history of marionettes: Magnin, *Histoire des marionettes* (1862). In addition, a collection of Magnin's essays culled from various periodicals was published in 1843: Magnin, *Causeries et meditations*.

²⁸ Magnin, *Les origines du théâtre moderne*, i–ii.

²⁹ “Depuis 1838, M. Magnin est entré à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres, où il a gagné, nous le craignons, la maladie du lieu, l'inactivité, la somnolence.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7: 303. Didron was one of the early champions of iconography and the study of Gothic art and architecture in mid-nineteenth-century France. In addition to his publication of the *Annales archéologiques*, Didron also published several books on medieval art and iconography, including *Manuel d'iconographie chrétienne* (1845), *Iconographie des chapiteaux* (1857), and *Manuel des objets de bronze et d'orfèvrerie* (1859). Ironically, Didron followed Magnin's example in publishing only one vol-

ume of what was to be his monumental study of Christian iconography: *Histoire de Dieu* in 1843. See Brisac and Léniaud, “Adolphe-Napoléon Didron,” 33–42.

³⁰ It is unclear which settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* Magnin may have known beyond the Rouen setting transmitted by Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and du Cange. He does not deal with the *Visitatio Sepulchri* directly in his lectures, but given his knowledge of Martène’s transcriptions of the dramatic rites from the Christmas season (see n. 20), we can presume he was likely familiar with those that Martène gave for the Easter season as well. Among these are settings of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from the *Regularis Concordia* and from the churches of Saint-Aper in Toul, Saint-Denis, Monte Cassino, Narbonne, Poitiers, Soissons, Saint-Martin in Tours, Laon, Vienne, Strasbourg, and Verdun. Martène, *De antiquis monachorum ritibus* (1690), 446 (*Regularis Concordia*, LOO 394–95), 446–47 (Saint-Aper in Toul, LOO 168A), 450 (Saint-Denis, not in LOO: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 564, 57r), and 450–51 (Monte Cassino, LOO 14: Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 364, 309v) and *Tractatus* (1706), 478–79 (Laon, LOO 109), 479–80 (Narbonne, LOO 116), 481–82 (Saint-Martin in Tours, LOO 63), 497–98 (Soissons, LOO 167: Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 8898, 97v–100v), 501 (Tours, LOO 169), 504 (Vienne, LOO 73), and 505 (Strasbourg, LOO 342). These were reprinted in Martène, *De antiquis ecclesiae ritibus* (1736–1738), 3:483–507 and 4:419–25 along with an additional settings from Poitiers (3:484, LOO 152) and Saint-Vitus in Verdun (4:853, LOO 360). All are given in the posthumous editions of 1763, 1783, and 1788 as well. For Martène’s sources, see Martimort, *La documentation liturgique de dom Edmond Martène*, 127–29, 157–58, 224–27, 496, 519–20, 523, and 544–47. For the Saint-Denis manuscript, which does not appear in LOO, see Foley, *The First Ordinary*, 195 and 387.

³¹ See, for example, Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 5–6: “Almost immediately [following Magnin’s lectures] there began the publication of numerous texts of an antiphonal nature from the liturgy together with the texts of Old French Plays. No close, comparative scrutiny of these texts was made, however, to test Magnin’s theory, because what he had asserted seemed so obvious.”

³² “Cette histoire, je l’écoutais avec une telle avidité, que je n’en ai oublié ni les contours essentiels, ni les faits principaux. Nourri tout fraîchement de cette science d’autrui, si excellente et substantielle, je fis un voyage de six mois, en 1836, dans plusieurs provinces de France et notamment dans le Midi. Attiré surtout vers les monuments religieux et, dans ces monuments, vers les représentations sculptées et peintes, les faits que M. Magnin avait esquissés dans ses leçons de la Sorbonne finirent par se développer singulièrement dans mon esprit. Ils me revenaient sans cesse à la mémoire, et je crus voir exécutés réellement, par les personnages de la sculpture et des vitraux, les drames liturgiques dont M. Magnin nous avait entretenus si longtemps sur les bancs de la Faculté.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:303–4.

³³ “Dans un cours memorable professé, en 1835, à la Sorbonne, M. Magnin,

de l'Institute, a déroulé pour la première fois les diverses phases du drame religieux, aristocratique et populaire, depuis l'origine du christianisme jusqu'aux temps modernes. Ce cours fut une véritable révélation. Des vues profondes, des considérations élevées, des aperçus ingénieux, des analyses multipliées, des rapprochements pleins de sagacité, ont fait de ces leçons une histoire des plus substantielles et des plus attrayantes." Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, v.

³⁴ Cargill, *Drama and Liturgy*, 6.

³⁵ Monmerqué, "Mysteria et miracula." A setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from a presumably lost thirteenth-century rituale from the cathedral at Sens (LOO 164) is given following the Fleury *Ludus Paschalis* (165–67). A setting from a late twelfth-century ordinal from the cathedral at Soissons, previously given in Martène's *Tractatus* of 1706 (LOO 167; Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS 8898, 97r–v) is provided as well (168–71). Also mentioned are others offered by Martène, including those from Tours, Vienne, and Strasbourg. See n. 30.

³⁶ Champollion-Figeac, *Hilarii Versus et Ludi*. Jacques Joseph Champollion-Figeac was elder brother of Jean-François Champollion, who had deciphered the Rosetta Stone. For a recent account of the younger Champollion, see Meyerson, *The Linguist and the Emperor*. The plays of Hilarius are contained in Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 11331, 9r–20v.

³⁷ Wright, *Early Mysteries*. Wright drew his editions of Latin medieval drama from other publications and not from the manuscripts themselves (as his subtitle claimed). His edition of what is now known as the "Fleury Playbook," was based on proofs from Monmerqué's "Mysteria et miracula" from 1834. The Passion play of the *Carmina Burana* was taken from Hoffman von Fallersleben's *Fundgruben* of 1837. The edition for the *Sponsus* of Paris 1139 was taken from a copy provided by Francisque Michel for his and Monmerqué's upcoming volume on medieval French drama, *Théâtre français au Moyen Âge* (1839). See Wright, *Early Mysteries*, vi–xiv.

³⁸ Kurz, *Oesterreich unter Herzog Albrecht IV*, 2:425–27. The Klosterneuburg *Visitatio Sepulchri* was the first liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* to be described in print as a dramatic, rather than as a liturgical event, although this occurred quite by accident. Kurz had very much wanted to publish the text of the Klosterneuburg *Ludus Paschalis* that Pez had noted the prior century in his *Thesaurus anecdotorum novissimus*, 2:liiii. But his counterpart at Klosterneuburg was unable to locate the manuscript containing the *ludus* and referred Kurz instead to the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCI 629, 103v–105v (LOO 595, a rituale copied around 1330), which Kurz published as his *Beylage Nro. 1*. For the exchange of letters between Kurz and Maximilian Fischer, librarian at Klosterneuburg, as well as the "rediscovery" of the *Ludus Paschalis* in the early twentieth century, see Pfeiffer, "Klosterneuburger Osterfeier und Osterspiel," 1–8. Pfeiffer also provided a facsimile of the *ludus* as an appendix. The *ludus* is found in Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibliothek, CCI 574, 142v–144v (LOO 829).

³⁹ Before Mone, little effort had been expended to uncover examples of the

liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* of Easter beyond those published in the liturgical collections of Martène and Le Brun des Marettes (Le Prévôt) and the few published in the 1830s, a result possibly of Magnin's earlier lack of interest in this ceremony. While Mone ignored the French sources found in those earlier collections, he did include two texts previously published in the liturgical collections of Gerbert: a setting of a *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Zurich (now Zurich, Zentralbibliothek, MS C.8.b., 55r–v [LOO 767]), published in Gerbert, *Vetus liturgia Alemannica* (1776), 3:864, and another from St. Blasien (manuscript lost [LOO 318]) in Gerbert, *Monumenta veteris liturgiae Alemannicae* (1777–1779), 2:237. One further setting of the *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Paris, although without manuscript citation, was published the same year as Mone's edition by Caron, *Notice historique*, 22.

⁴⁰ Du Ménil was the first among the new scholars of medieval theater to publish the early tenth-century Introit trope *Quem quaeritis* from Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 1240, 30v (LOO 52—Saint-Martial troper; du Ménil, 97) as well as the *Visitatio Sepulchri* contained within the later-tenth-century *Regularis Concordia* (Du Ménil, 116–17), the former seen by some later critics as the oldest, if not the original, form of the trope, and the latter considered by most subsequent scholars to be the first fully-formed liturgical drama. Du Ménil attached no such significance to these texts, however, as he relegated both to footnotes. The *Visitatio Sepulchri* of the *Regularis Concordia* (LOO 394–95) was well known to students of the liturgy, however, having been published twice before the turn of the eighteenth century, first in 1626 by Baker in *Apostolatus Benedictinorum*, “Appendix,” 89 and in 1690 by Martène in *De antiquis monachorum ritibus*, 446.

⁴¹ Du Ménil's use of the expression “drame liturgique” is limited to discussions of the larger religious dramas found in Mone's collection, such as the Passion of Donaueschingen and the Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, where he used the expression to refer to the liturgical quotations found within these texts. In a footnote to some of the German lines in the Passion of the *Carmina Burana*, for example, he noted (p. 117): “The German Passion of Donaueschingen . . . also preserved in its original language several fragments of a liturgical drama, and this source of all mysteries in the vernacular appears even more prominently in the Passion, published by the learned editor, after a manuscript from the fourteenth century in the library of St. Gall.” (La Passion allemande de Donaueschingen . . . avait même conservé dans leur langue primitive plusieurs fragments d'un drame liturgique, et cette source de tous les mystères en langue vulgaire se montre avec encore plus d'évidence dans la Passion publiée par ce savant éditeur, d'après un ms. du XIVe siècle, de la Bibliothèque de Saint-Gall.)

⁴² The *Visitatio Sepulchri* from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 366 (*olim* 179), pp. 55–56 (LOO 563) and that from Engelberg, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 314 (*olim* 4/25), 75v–78v (LOO 784), for example, were labeled “Osterfeiern,” while the longer, and more elaborate setting of the Easter play from Einsiedeln, Stiftsbibliothek, MS 300, pp. 93–94 (LOO 783) was labeled “Osterspiel.” This latter setting, included by Young among the texts of his third stage, followed a series

of sermons and other works of Peter Abelard and thus offered no liturgical connection, a peculiarity that Young saw as “totally irrelevant” (Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:389–90).

⁴³ Du Méril, *Origines latines*, consistently labeled settings of the liturgical *Visitatio Sepulchri* as “Office du Sépulcre” or “Office de la Résurrection” (89, 91, 94, 96, 98, 100, and 101), the *Officium Pastorum* as “Office des Pasteurs” (147), and the *Officium Stellae* as “Office des Mages” or “Office de l’Étoile” (151 and 153). The plays of the Fleury manuscript, conversely, were labeled either “mystère,” e.g., “Mystère de la Résurrection” (108), “Mystère de l’Apparition à Emmaüs” (120), and “Mystère de l’Adoration des Mages” (162), or given no designation at all, e.g., “Massacre de saints Innocents” (173).

⁴⁴ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 355.

⁴⁵ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 359.

⁴⁶ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 359.

⁴⁷ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 361.

⁴⁸ Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*, 361.

⁴⁹ Smither, *History of the Oratorio*, 3:541–44 and 579–82. A summary is provided by Rowden, “Choral Music and Music-Making in France,” 206.

⁵⁰ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame du Moyen Âge” (1847–1848) continued as “Le drame liturgique” (1848–1851).

⁵¹ The opening sentence of his essay on Easter week, for example, signaled both the thrust of his essays and his metaphorical understanding of the expression “drame liturgique,” noting with respect to the liturgical sequence that precedes the Gospel during Mass that “sequences occupy an important place in the liturgical drama” (“Les séquences occupaient dans le drame liturgique une place importante). Clément, “Drame liturgique,” 10:154.

⁵² On the neo-Gallican reforms of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see Hiley, “Neo-Gallican Chant” and Emerson et al., “Plainchant,” 852–53. On the ultramontanes in nineteenth-century France, see Moulinet, “Un réseau ultramontain.” The larger liturgical movement is treated by Franklin, *Nineteenth-Century Churches*. Briefer accounts are provided by Emerson, “Plainchant,” 853–58 (pp. 853–55 deal specifically with the reform movement in France), and Ellis, *Interpreting the Musical Past*, esp. 21, 71–72, and 194–202. Bergeron, *Decadent Enchantments* provides an engaging history of the efforts to restore the chant of the Middle Ages by the monks of Solesmes. See also the history given by Combe, *Histoire de la restauration*.

⁵³ This manuscript was later identified by Coussemaker (*Drames liturgiques*, 335) as Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS lat. 904 (hereafter Paris 904), a thirteenth-century gradual from the cathedral at Rouen. The manuscript was acquired by the Bibliothèque royale in the early eighteenth century as a part of a cache of rare manuscripts and printed books purchased from the collection originally assembled by the seventeenth-century collector Jean Bigot (1588–1645), seigneur of Sommesnil and counselor at the court of Normandy. See Delisle, *Le*

cabinet des manuscrits, 1:322–29 (“Bibliothèque des Bigot. 1706”) and Delisle, *Bibliotheca Bigotiana manuscripta*.

⁵⁴ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:between 312 and 313.

⁵⁵ Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:between 36 and 37. The facsimile of Philip the Chancellor’s sequence, *Ave gloriosa virginum*, drawn from a Soissons manuscript now in Paris (Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS nouv. acq. fr. 24541), and which appears within Clément’s discussion of Easter Sunday (10:between 154 and 155), is associated with the article by Jouve, “Histoire de l’harmonie,” which includes the conclusion of the facsimile.

⁵⁶ I borrow this insight from DonnaLee Dox, who noted in a private communication (June 2, 2011), “Magnin recoups the past as historical trajectory leading to the more perfect present. Clément, on the other hand, recoups the past as superior with a utilitarian purpose – to bring old practices into current use because they are better. . . . Clément’s is a recuperative effort that idealizes the past as perfect in comparison with the present.”

⁵⁷ This text was variously employed in medieval liturgical manuscripts, most often as a trope to the Sanctus or Agnus Dei. See the discussions by Schlager, “*Trinitas, unitas, deitas*” and Iversen, “Music as *Ancilla verbi*.” The text was edited in AH 47:348–49 (#345) and in Iversen, *Tropes du Sanctus*, 196–99 (no. 161*). The text cited by Clément was drawn from Sens, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 46, 3r–v, where it was included in first vespers for the office of the Circumcision, as *versiculus* after the prosa that followed the responsory *Descendit de coelis*. The text and music from this manuscript was given in Villetard, *Office de Pierre de Corbeil*, 90–91 [text] and 136 [music]. The melody was treated also by, among others, Gastoué, *Les anciens chants liturgiques*, 9 and 18 and Arlt, *Ein Festoffizium des Mittelalters*, 2:124–25. On the new office of the Circumcision in thirteenth-century France and its relation to the Feast of Fools, see the discussions by Fassler, “The Feast of Fools” and Harris, *Sacred Folly*, 98–112.

⁵⁸ “Quelle grandeur! quelle pompeuse énumération! quelle sonorité! La pensée du moyen âge apparaît tout entière dans cette poésie avec son originalité et sa hardiesse. L’expression musicale s’élève ou se modère, suivant la force des images; elle arrive à son paroxysme lorsqu’elle exprime ces mots: ‘Tu Theos et heros, dives flos, vivens ros, rege nos, salva nos, perdue nos ad Thronos superos et vera gaudia.’ Ce n’est là qu’un exemple entre mille de la merveilleuse fécondité des poètes du XIIIe siècle.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:41.

⁵⁹ The hymn text, *Debilis cessant elementa legis*, was written by l’Abbé Sebastian Besnault (d. 1724), who served as priest at the church of Saint-Maurice in Sens. The hymn was included in the Paris Breviary of 1736 (*Breviarium Parisiensis, Pars hiemalis* [1736], 272–73) and was still in use a century later (*Breviarium Parisiensis, Pars hiemalis* [1836], 260–61). This text survives in many contemporary Protestant hymnals. A musical setting by Johann Sebastian Bach, for example, is given to an English translation of Besnault’s text, “The Ancient Law Departs,” in *The Lutheran Hymnal*, #117 as well as in the more recent *Lutheran*

Service Book, #898. See also Julian, *A Dictionary of Hymnology*, 285.

⁶⁰ “Tout le monde, les enfants, les hommes, les femmes mêmes, étrangères pour la plupart au latin, seront frappés du rythme, des articulations sonores de notre hymne du XIII^e siècle; tandis que celle qui l’a remplacée ne saurait tout au plus être goûtée que par le très-petit nombre de professeurs de rhétorique.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:41–42.

⁶¹ “De quel côté était la vraie poésie, la véritable intelligence de l’art chrétien? Était-ce dans cette noble, grandiose et féconde série d’épithètes toutes resplendissantes d’images, ou dans ce chétif quatrain, moitié poétique, moitié philosophique, dont les mots, déplacés par l’exigence du mètre, sont autant de tronçons de reptiles courant les uns après les autres. Que sont venus faire dans la liturgie chrétienne ces intrus, ces vers saphiques, adoniques, avec leurs pieds molosses, anapestes et bachiques?” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:42.

⁶² “Pourquoi ne pas nous ramener tout de suite à adorer Jupiter et Saturne?” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:42.

⁶³ “Comment admettre que les hommes qui ont fait toutes ces choses aient fait grâce au plain-chant? Non-seulement ils l’ont mutilé et rendu presque méconnaissable, mais encore, ne le comprenant plus, ils ont inventé des systèmes absolus, basés sur des rapports imaginaires ou fortuits. En un mot, impuissants à comprendre l’ancien plain-chant, ils en ont inventé un nouveau, et le moindre mal qu’ils ont causé a été d’empêcher les compositeurs de rien écrire en plain-chant. Qui d’entre eux, en effet, s’assujettirait à ce fatras de règles que les monuments ne justifient pas. Aucun ne l’a fait dans aucun temps et pas un ne le fera. Le chant du moyen âge, comme tout art, n’est rien moins qu’encyclopédique.” Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 8:85–86. Among the new treatises on chant composition that accompanied the neo-Gallican liturgical reforms (see n. 52) were Nivers, *Méthode certaine* (1666) and *Dissertation* (1683); Lebeuf, *Traité historique et pratique* (1741); Poisson, *Nouvelle method* (1745); Feillée, *Méthode nouvelle* (1748); Oudoux, *Méthode nouvelle* (1772); and Imbert, *Nouvelle methode* (1780). See also Lescat, *Méthodes et traités musicaux*.

⁶⁴ Danjou, “Le théâtre religieux,” edition after p. 81. The manuscript was owned at that time by M. Pacchiorotti of Padua. It was purchased by the British Museum in 1883 and stored under the shelf number: Egerton 2615. See the *Catalogue of Additions*, no. Eg. 2615. Danjou, who served as organist at the cathedral of Notre-Dame in Paris, is perhaps best known by musicologists for his discovery in 1847 of the Saint-Bénigne tonary: Montpellier, Faculté des médecine, MS H. 159. Danjou, “Découverte d’un exemplaire.”

⁶⁵ Coussemaker, *Histoire de l’harmonie*, 24–39; facsimiles are provided in Plates 13–23 and musical transcriptions are given in examples 18–21. The chapter on *Drame liturgique* was published separately in Didron’s *Annales archéologiques* the year prior, although without the facsimiles or examples. The chapter was devoted to the plays of Paris 1139 as outlined earlier by Magnin (see nn. 21–22). Coussemaker’s facsimiles showed the folios in their original contexts as well,

beginning with the rubric “Hoc est de mulieribus” (omitting the conclusion of the preceding *versus*) a fact that escaped the notice of Carol Symes in her critique of the one-page facsimile from the same manuscript included in Coussemaker’s later study, *Drames liturgiques* (1860). In her essay, “The Appearance,” 794–95, Symes took Coussemaker to task for having removed the play from its manuscript context when he merged portions of two folios onto the single-page facsimile in *Drames liturgiques* (beginning with the rubric “Sponsus”). Since he had provided the full facsimile in context in his earlier study, however, and since he was focusing only on the *Sponsus* portion of the manuscript as outlined earlier by Magnin, it is unlikely that Coussemaker intended the acontextual reading that Symes discerns. His intent, rather, was more instructive than interpretive, “to give an idea of the original notation by reproducing a facsimile from each manuscript” (“de donner une idée de la notation originale, nous avons reproduit un facsimile de chacun des manuscrits”). Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, xvii.

⁶⁶ Luzarche, *Office de Pâques*. Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 927, 1r–8v (twelfth-century miscellany, LOO 824). The text of the *Jeu d’Adam* from this manuscript was published by Luzarche two years earlier as *Adam: Drame anglo-normand*.

⁶⁷ Coussemaker, *Office du sépulcre*. Saint-Quentin, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 86, pp. 609–25 (thirteenth-century miscellany, LOO 825).

⁶⁸ D’Ortigue, *Dictionnaire liturgiques*, 508–13.

⁶⁹ Douhet, *Dictionnaire des mystères*. Included in this work are articles on the Fleury manuscript: “Apparition de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ (L’),” 150–53; “Benoît-sur-Loire (Manuscrit de Saint),” 199–201; “Filles dotées (Les),” 373–75; “Fils de Getron (Le),” 375–78; “Hérode ou l’Adoration des Mages” 402–6; “Innocents (Le massacre des),” 459–61; “Juif volé (Le),” 479–82; “Lazare ressuscité (Saint),” 486–89; “Miracles de Saint-Nicolas,” 517; “Paul (Conversion de Saint),” 825–26; “Résurrection (La),” 855–57 (first of the *représentations dramatiques* following the *rites figurées*); and the “Trois clercs (Les),” 970–72. In addition are articles dealing with the plays of Hilarius: “Daniel d’Hilaire,” 279–84; “Hilaire, disciple d’Abailard,” 406–7; “Lazare (La Résurrection de),” 489–92; and “Nicolas (La statue de saint),” 533–40 (also includes a discussion on *Le jeu de saint Nicolas* of Jean Bodel) as well as articles on the *rites figurées*: “Nativité de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ,” 519–22; “Résurrection (La),” 847–55; and “Trois Rois (Les),” 973–75.

⁷⁰ The chapter on *Drame liturgique* occupies pages 89–318 (of 597).

⁷¹ “Si j’avais eu le temps, j’aurais sans doute composé quelque livre sur ce sujet, et je l’aurais intitulé: ‘Liturgie dramatique, ou Drame liturgique au moyen âge’, Commençant avec l’année religieuse, à l’Avent, j’aurais parcouru le cycle entier, de Noël, à l’Épiphanie, au Carême, aux Rameaux, à Pâques, à l’Ascension, à la Pentecôte, à la Trinité, à la Fête-Dieu, à l’Assomption, jusqu’à la Toussaint. Puis, entre ces grandes stations, j’aurais recueilli les principaux saints, chacun au jour de sa fête, et j’aurais ainsi exploré, sous le rapport du drame, le cycle entier de l’année

religieuse.” Didron, Introduction to Clément, “Liturgie, musique et drame,” 7:305.

⁷² “ces *kiriolès* de Remiremont, cette procession du *Renard*, cet enterrement du mardi gras, ces travestissements en animaux de toutes sortes, ces mille folies dont on peut voir de détail dans le glossaire de Ducange. . . . Ce dévergondage de l’esprit dura assez long-temps; mais, vers le XIV^e siècle, le progrès des mœurs et l’épuration des idées chassèrent ces farces sacrilèges, et les symboles primitifs eux-mêmes firent place à une idée plus spiritualiste. Ces drames liturgiques, expulsés de l’Église, montèrent sur les tréteaux, et le théâtre antique était sorti jadis des mystères d’Eleusis.” Bazelaire, “Le dernier des mystères,” 20–21.

⁷³ “suspendre agréablement l’action du drame liturgique.” Scudo, *Le chevalier Sarti*, 161–62.

⁷⁴ “la valeur absolue de l’oeuvre de Palestrina . . . a touché à toutes les parties du drame liturgique.” Scudo, *Le chevalier Sarti*, 368.

⁷⁵ Coussemaker’s biography was given shortly after his death by Dehaines in “Notice sur la vie,” which served as a preface to Coussemaker’s *Troubles religieux du XVIe siècle*, 1:i–xxv. Appended to the article are a bibliography of Coussemaker’s writings in music, history, and archeology (xxxvi–xliv) along with a collection of notices on the death of Coussemaker (xlv–lii). A summary of Coussemaker’s contribution to musicology is provided also by Aubry, *La musicologie médiévale*, 64–68. A recent dissertation by Coussemaker’s grand-niece, Solange de Coussemaker-Van Robais, “Comité flamand de France” (2010) treats Coussemaker’s role in preserving Flemish culture in France.

⁷⁶ Among Coussemaker’s most important publications are: *Hucbald moine de St. Amand et ses traités de la musique* (1841), *Histoire de l’harmonie au Moyen Âge* (1852), *Les harmonistes des XIIe et XIIIe siècles* (1864), *Les harmonistes du XIVe siècle* (1869), and *Scriptorum de musica medii* (1864–1876).

⁷⁷ Coussemaker, *Oeuvres complètes du trouvère Adam de la Halle* (1872).

⁷⁸ Coussemaker, *Chant populaires des Flamands de France* (1856).

⁷⁹ “Les drames liturgiques sont ceux qui se liaient d’une manière intime aux cérémonies du culte; ils étaient la mise en action des offices des temps et des saints. . . . Les mystères étaient représentés sur un théâtre proprement dit et par des acteurs laïques.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, viii.

⁸⁰ “Indépendamment de la différence qui existait entre les drames liturgiques et les mystères, il convient, suivant nous, d’établir aussi une distinction entre les drames liturgiques eux-mêmes. Ceux-ci étaient de deux sortes: les uns se liaient étroitement aux cérémonies religieuses, et faisaient en quelque sorte corps avec elles, en empruntant le texte liturgique qu’on paraphrasait légèrement, et qu’on mettait en dialogue pour le besoin de l’action. Les autres, tout en ayant le même caractère religieux, n’avaient pas une liaison aussi intime avec le culte. Ce furent déjà de véritables créations dramatiques. Ils ont pour sujet le texte sacré; mais le développement qu’on y donna en fit des compositions spéciales dont l’étendue ne permit plus de conserver leur place dans les offices.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, ix–x.

⁸¹ The effect was not immediate. The following year, for example, Jouve, “Du Théâtre et de ses diverse conditions,” 353–69, continued to use the expression in the more expansive sense favored by Magnin and Clément even though the author was well aware of Coussemaker’s edition.

⁸² Coussemaker, *Drames liturgique*, 311–47.

⁸³ “Ce mystère avait son orgine dans la liturgie catholique. C’est donc un véritable drame liturgique.” Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques*, 318.

⁸⁴ “Le caractère plus ou moins obligatoire des drames qui avaient place dans la liturgie est l’une des nuances, souvent difficiles à saisir, qui servent à distinguer le mystère liturgique de cette espèce de transition à laquelle, le premier, j’ai cru devoir imposer le nom de mystère semi-liturgique, indiquant par là une sorte de mélange, de compromis, si l’on veut, où se confondent encore le culte et le drame proprement dit, bien que ce dernier tende visiblement à s’émanciper et à rompre les liens qui le retiennent au sein de cette liturgie où il a pris naissance.” Sepet, “Prophètes du Christ,” 29:223–24.

⁸⁵ Sepet, “Prophètes du Christ,” 29:264–65.

⁸⁶ Gautier, “Origines du théâtre moderne.”

⁸⁷ Gautier expanded on this discussion in *Histoire de la poésie liturgique—les tropes* (1886).

⁸⁸ Soane, *New Curiosities of Literature*, 1:191. Soane’s approach to the rite of the sepulcher was little different from that of his predecessors. William Hone, for example, in his *Ancient Mysteries Described* (1823), 220–22 drew from Marnix/Gilpin, *Beehive of the Romish Church* (1569/1579), 201r in his discussion of “theatrical performances by the clergy,” performances that include what appears to be a *Visitatio Sepulchri* along with other rites such as the Adoration of the Cross of Good Friday and other ritual practices from Pentecost and the Ascension. See chapter 3, pp. 93–97 (“Protestant Protests”).

⁸⁹ Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, 2:427.

⁹⁰ Rock, *The Church of Our Fathers*, 3/2:102–4. Rock provides a translation of the text on p. 102 and gives the Latin on pp. 103–4.

⁹¹ Ward, *A History of English Dramatic Literature*, 1:6.

⁹² Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, 21–24. The following year, Stoddard took up the professorship at New York University. Stoddard’s biography to about the year 1900 is available in the *National Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 10:143. Within the section on “Latin Liturgical Drama,” Stoddard provided entries for all previously published exemplars of Latin liturgical drama as well as references to the available scholarly literature. While he provided references to the works of Clément, Didron, Coussemaker, Sepet, and Gautier, he omitted any references to the pioneering work of Magnin. This oversight was corrected in a supplement to Stoddard’s bibliography provided two decades later by Klein, “A Contribution,” 202–5.

⁹³ Chambers, *Mediaeval Stage*, 2:xviii, 7, 10, 15, 36, 39, 41, 44, 50, 51, 64, 71, 75, 88, 92, 93, 96, 97, 108, 132, 143, 146, and 157. I exclude here the expression

“liturgical play(s),” which is equally common.

⁹⁴ Young, *Drama of the Medieval Church*, 1:xiv, 81, 260, and 550; 2:244 and 397.

⁹⁵ Pröll, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1880–1883), especially the chapter on “Entwicklung der kirchlichen Spiele bis zum Uebergang derselben in die Volkssprache” (1/1:35–60).

⁹⁶ See, for example, Schubiger, *Musikalische Spicilegien* (1876) and Wagemann, *Geschichte des Oratoriums* (1882), whose discussion of “Die deutschen liturgischen Dramen” (36–40) is drawn from Schubiger’s *Musikalische Spicilegien* and that of “Die französischen liturgischen Dramen” (40–50) from Coussemaker’s *Drames liturgiques*.

⁹⁷ Hase, *Das geistliche Schauspiel* (1858).

⁹⁸ Reidt, *Das geistliche Schauspiel* (1868), 12–24.

⁹⁹ Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas* (1893), 1:47–107. Creizenach also used the expression “geistlichen Drama.”

¹⁰⁰ Wilken, *Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele* (1872).

¹⁰¹ Milchsack, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1880).

¹⁰² Lange, *Programmabhandlung* (1881) and *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern* (1887).